BEFORE THE BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

Case No. 4193

ALBERT WONG 20843 Timberline Lane Diamond Bar, CA 91789

Pharmacist License No. RPH 48183

AND

THE MEDICINE SHOPPE, ALBERT WONG, PHARMACIST-IN-CHARGE 12447 Central Avenue Chino, CA 91710

Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 48384

Respondent.

DECISION AND ORDER

The attached Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby adopted by the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, as its Decision in this matter.

This decision shall become effective on October 26, 2012.

It is so ORDERED on September 26, 2012.

BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(. Wusi

Ву

STANLEY C. WEISSER Board President

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California GLORIA A. BARRIOS Supervising Deputy Attorney General MICHAEL BROWN Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 231237 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2095 Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 E-mail: MichaelB.Brown@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE		
	BOARD OF PHARMACY		
9	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 4193	
12	ALBERT WONG	STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AND	
13	20843 Timberline Lane Diamond Bar, CA 91789 Original Pharmacist License No. DDH 48183	DISCIPLINARY ORDER	
14	Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 48183 Respondent,		
15	•	·	
16	AND		
17	THE MEDICINE SHOPPE, ALBERT WONG,		
18	PHARMACIST -IN-CHARGE 12447 Central Avenue Chino, CA 91710		
19	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 48384		
20	Respondent.		
21		,	
22	In the interest of a prompt and speedy settlement of this matter, consistent with the public		
23	interest and the responsibility of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs, the		
24	parties hereby agree to the following Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order which will be		
25	submitted to the Board of Pharmacy for approval and adoption as the final disposition of		
26	Accusation No. 4193 filed against Respondents The Medicine Shoppe and Albert Wong.		
27	111		
28	111		
		1	

STIPULATED SETTLEMENT (Case No. 4193)

28 | ///

PARTIES

- Virginia Herold (Complainant) is the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy.
 She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in this matter by Kamala
 D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Michael Brown, Deputy Attorney
 General.
- The Medicine Shoppe and Albert Wong (Respondents) are represented in this
 proceeding by attorney George G. Braunstein, whose address is 11755 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite
 2400, Los Angeles, California 90025.
- 3. On or about March 23, 2007, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Permit No. PHY 48384 to The Medicine Shoppe; and Albert Wong (Respondent Medicine Shoppe). The Pharmacy License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 4193. The Original Permit expired on November 24, 2010, and has not been renewed.
- 4. On or about August 11, 1995, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 48183 to Albert Wong (Respondent Wong). The Original Pharmacist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 4193 and will expire on February 28, 2013, unless renewed.
- 5. The Board records indicate Respondent Wong was the Pharmacist-in-Charge for Respondent Pharmacy since March 23, 2007.

JURISDICTION

6. Accusation No. 4193 was filed before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, and is currently pending against Respondents. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondents on November 21, 2011. Respondents timely filed a Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 4193 is attached as exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 7. Respondents have carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 4193. Respondents have also carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order.
- 8. Respondents are fully aware of their legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel at their own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against them; the right to present evidence and to testify on their own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 9. Respondent Medicine Shoppe and Respondent Wong voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waive and gives up each and every right set forth above.

CULPABILITY

10. Respondent Medicine Shoppe and Respondent Wong admits the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 4193. Respondents agree that their licenses are subject to discipline and agree to be bound by the discipline imposed by the Board of Pharmacy as set forth in the Disciplinary Order below.

CONTINGENCY

11. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Board of Pharmacy. Respondents understand and agree that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Board of Pharmacy may communicate directly with the Board of Pharmacy regarding this stipulation and settlement, without notice to Respondents or participation by Respondents or their counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondents understand and agree that they may not withdraw the agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board of Pharmacy considers and acts upon it. If the Board of Pharmacy fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall

be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board of Pharmacy shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.

- 12. The parties understand and agree that facsimile copies of this Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order, including facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 13. This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is intended by the parties to be an integrated writing representing the complete, final, and exclusive embodiment of their agreement. It supersedes any and all prior or contemporaneous agreements, understandings, discussions, negotiations, and commitments (written or oral). This Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order may not be altered, amended, modified, supplemented, or otherwise changed except by a writing executed by an authorized representative of each of the parties.
- 14. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Disciplinary Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Citation Nos. CI 2008 39565 and CI 2009 42768, issued on or about January 29, 2010 to Respondent Medicine Shoppe and Respondent Wong, respectively, as well as the abatements and fines ordered by those Citations, are withdrawn and/or dismissed.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondent Medicine Shoppe is jointly and responsible for the truth of each and every charge and allegation in Accusation No. 4193. Respondent Medicine Shoppe is jointly, responsible and liable for the civil penalties to the Board of Pharmacy in the amount of \$36,000.00 (Thirty Six Thousand Dollars).

DISCIPLINARY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 48183 issued to Respondent Wong is revoked. However, the revocation is stayed and Respondent Wong is placed on probation for five (5) years on the following terms and conditions.

28 ///

TERMS APPLICABLE TO RESPONDENT WONG

1. Payment of Civil Penalties

Respondent Wong shall pay civil penalties to the Board of Pharmacy in the amount and on such terms as specified below. Respondent Wong understands and agrees that such civil penalties are administrative fines pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(7), and as such are not dischargeable in bankruptcy. Respondent Wong further understands and agrees that the filing of bankruptcy by Respondent Wong shall not relieve Respondent of the obligation to pay the balance of the civil penalties to the Board. Respondent Wong shall be liable for payment to the Board of \$36,000.00 (Thirty Six Thousand Dollars) in civil penalties. Respondent Wong shall pay \$3,000.00 (Three Thousand Dollars) on or before the effective date of this decision, and shall thereafter make eleven (11) quarterly payments of \$3,000.00 (Three Thousand Dollars) every ninety (90) days until the entire balance is paid in full. Respondent Wong may pay the full remaining balance due at any time, and may make extra payments. Aside from such expedited payment, there shall be no deviation from this schedule absent prior written approval by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee. Failure to pay the civil penalties by the deadlines as directed shall be considered a violation of probation.

Further, absent prior written approval by the Board or its designee, Respondent Wong may not successfully complete probation until this amount is paid in full. Each Respondent is responsible for payment of the full amount and neither may claim to owe only a portion or a share.

2. Community Services Program - Testimonial

Respondent Wong has authored a letter describing his incentives to participate and his level of participation in filling and/or dispensing internet prescriptions, and detailing the consequences of this participation for him, his family, the public health, and the profession, what he has learned from this experience, and what he would advise others who are approached to fill or dispense internet prescriptions. The letter is attached hereto as Exhibit "B", is incorporated herein by reference, and is part of Respondent Wong's public record of discipline with the Board of

Pharmacy. The Board of Pharmacy may print, reprint, quote, or make other use of this letter in its communications and/or on its website.

Further, upon provision of reasonable notice, Respondent Wong shall appear for and take part in a video recording of Respondent Wong reading the letter, the video message shall be completed within the first year of probation. The video recording shall be similarly subject to use by the Board of Pharmacy in its communications and/or on its website. Failure by Respondent Wong, upon reasonable notice, to timely appear for and participate in such videotaping shall be considered a violation of probation.

3. Obey All Laws

Respondent Wong shall obey all state and federal laws and regulations. Respondent Wong shall report any of the following occurrences to the board, in writing, within seventy-two (72) hours of such occurrence:

- an arrest or issuance of a criminal complaint for violation of any provision of the Pharmacy Law, state and federal food and drug laws, or state and federal controlled substances laws
- a plea of guilty or nolo contendre in any state or federal criminal proceeding to any criminal complaint, information or indictment
- a conviction of any crime
- discipline, citation, or other administrative action filed by any state or federal agency which involves either of Respondents' licenses or which is related to the practice of pharmacy or the manufacturing, obtaining, handling, distributing, billing, or charging for any drug, device or controlled substance.

Failure to timely report such occurrence(s) shall be considered a violation of probation.

4. Report to the Board

Respondent Wong shall report to the board quarterly, on a schedule as directed by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee. The report shall be made either in person or in writing, as directed. Among other requirements, Respondent Wong shall state in each report under penalty of perjury whether there has been compliance with all the terms and conditions of probation. Failure to submit timely reports in a form as directed shall be considered a violation of probation. Any period of delinquency in submission of reports as directed may be added to the total period of probation. Moreover, if the final probation report is not made as directed, the probation shall

be automatically extended until such time as the final report is made and accepted by the Board of Pharmacy.

5. Interview with the Board

Upon receipt of reasonable prior notice, Respondent Wong shall appear in person for interviews with the Board of Pharmacy or its designee, at such intervals and locations as are determined by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee. The owner or officer of Respondent Pharmacy shall make the appearance on behalf of Respondent Medicine Shoppe. Failure to appear for any scheduled interview without prior notification to the Board of Pharmacy staff, or failure to appear for two (2) or more scheduled interviews during the period of probation, shall be considered a violation of probation.

6. Cooperate with Board Staff

Respondent Wong shall cooperate with the Board of Pharmacy's inspection program and with the Board of Pharmacy's monitoring and investigation of Respondents' compliance with the terms and conditions of their probation(s). Failure to cooperate shall be considered a violation of probation.

7. Reimbursement of Board Costs

Reimbursement of costs per Business and Professions Code section 125.3 is waived.

8. Probation Monitoring Costs

Respondent Wong shall pay all costs associated with probation monitoring as determined by the Board of Pharmacy each and every year of probation. Such costs shall be payable to the Board of Pharmacy on a schedule as directed by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee. Failure to pay such costs by the deadline as directed shall be considered a violation of probation.

9. Status of License

Respondent Wong at all times while on probation, maintain an active, current license with the Board of Pharmacy, including any period during which suspension or probation is tolled. Failure to maintain an active, current license shall be considered a violation of probation. If Respondent Wong's license expires or is cancelled by operation of law or otherwise at any time during the period of probation, including any extensions thereof due to tolling or otherwise, upon

renewal or reapplication that Respondent's license shall be subject to all terms and conditions of this probation not previously satisfied.

10. License Surrender While on Probation/Suspension

Following the effective date of this decision, should Respondent Wong cease to practice due to retirement or health, or be otherwise unable to satisfy the terms and conditions of probation, that Respondent Wong may tender its license to the Board of Pharmacy for surrender. The Board of Pharmacy or its designee shall have the discretion whether to grant the request for surrender or take any other appropriate and reasonable action. Upon formal acceptance of the surrender of the license, Respondent Wong will no longer be subject to the terms and conditions of probation. This surrender constitutes a record of discipline and shall become a part of the Respondent Wong's license history with the Board of Pharmacy.

Within ten (10) days of notification by the Board of Pharmacy that the surrender is accepted, Respondent Wong shall relinquish its pocket and wall licenses to the Board of Pharmacy. Upon surrender, Respondent Wong may not reapply for any license from the Board of Pharmacy for three (3) years from the effective date of the surrender. Respondent Wong shall meet all requirements applicable to the license sought as of the date of submitted to the Board of Pharmacy, including any outstanding costs.

11. Violation of Probation

If Respondent Wong has not complied with any term or condition of probation, the Board of Pharmacy shall have continuing jurisdiction over the Respondent Wong, and probation shall automatically be extended, until all terms and conditions have been satisfied or the Board of Pharmacy has taken other action as deemed appropriate to treat the failure to comply as a violation of probation, to terminate probation, and to impose the penalty that was stayed.

If Respondent Wong violates probation in any respect, the Board of Pharmacy, after giving Respondent Wong notice and an opportunity to be heard, may revoke probation as to that Respondent and carry out the disciplinary order that was stayed. If a petition to revoke probation or an accusation is filed during probation, the Board of Pharmacy shall have continuing

jurisdiction and the period of probation shall be automatically extended until the petition to revoke probation or accusation is heard and decided.

12. Completion of Probation

Upon written notice by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee indicating successful completion of probation, the successfully-completing Respondent Wong's license will be fully restored.

13. Continuing Education

Respondent Wong shall provide evidence of efforts to maintain skill and knowledge as a Pharmacist as directed by the Board of Pharmacy or its designee.

14. Notice to Employers

During the period of probation, Respondent Wong shall notify all present and prospective employers of the decision in Accusation No. 4193 and the terms, conditions, and restrictions imposed on Respondent by the decision, as follows:

Within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision, and within fifteen (15) days of Respondent Wong undertaking any new employment, Respondent Wong shall cause his direct supervisor, pharmacist-in-charge (including each new pharmacist-in-charge employed during Respondent's tenure of employment) and owner to report to the Board of Pharmacy in writing acknowledging that the listed individual(s) has/have read the decision in Accusation No. 4193 and all the terms and conditions imposed thereby. It shall be Respondent Wong's responsibility to ensure that his employer(s) and/or supervisor submit the timely acknowledgments to the Board of Pharmacy. If Respondent Wong works for or is employed by or through a pharmacy employment service, Respondent Wong must notify his direct supervisor, pharmacist-in-charge, and owner at every entity licensed by the Board of Pharmacy of the terms and conditions of the decision in Accusation No. 4193 in advance of Respondent commencing work at each licensed entity. A record of this notification must be provided to the Board of Pharmacy upon request.

Furthermore, within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this decision, and within fifteen (15) days of Respondent Wong undertaking any new employment by or through a pharmacy employment service, Respondent Wong shall cause his direct supervisor with the pharmacy

 employment service to report to the Board of Pharmacy in writing acknowledging he/she has read the decision in Accusation No. 4193 and the terms and conditions imposed thereby. It shall be Respondent Wong's responsibility to ensure his employer(s) and/or supervisor(s) submit timely acknowledgment(s). "Employment" within the meaning of this provision shall include any full-time, part-time, temporary, relief or pharmacy management service as a pharmacist or any position for which a pharmacist license is a requirement or criterion for employment, whether the respondent is an employee, independent contractor or volunteer.

Failure to timely notify present or prospective employer(s) or to cause those employer(s) to submit timely acknowledgments to the Board of Pharmacy shall be considered a violation of probation.

15. Notification of a Change in Employment, Name, Address, or Phone

Respondent Wong shall notify the board in writing within ten (10) days of any change of employment. Said notification shall include the reasons for leaving, the address of the new employer, the name of the supervisor and owner, and the work schedule. Respondent Wong shall further notify the board in writing within ten (10) days of a change in name, residence address, mailing address, or phone number.

Failure to timely notify the Board of Pharmacy of any change in employer, name, address or phone number shall be considered a violation of probation.

16. Tolling of Probation

Except during periods of suspension, Respondent Wong shall at all times while on probation, be employed as a pharmacist in California for a minimum of forty (40) hours per calendar month. Any month during which this minimum is not met shall toll the period of probation, i.e., the period of probation shall be extended by one month for each month during which this minimum is not met. During any such period of tolling of probation, Respondent Wong must nonetheless comply with all terms and conditions of probation.

Should Respondent Wong, regardless of residency, for any reason (including vacation) cease practicing as a pharmacist for a minimum of forty (40) hours per calendar month in California, Respondent Wong must notify the Board of Pharmacy in writing within ten (10) days

11
STIPULATED SETTLEMENT (Case No. 4193)

1	-		
]	DATED: 2/20/12		
2	THE MEDICINE SHOPPE; ALBERT WONG		
3	By: ALBERT WONG Respondent		
4			
6			
7	DATED: VAIL (no Win		
8	ALBERT WONG Respondent		
9	I have read and fully discussed with Respondents the terms and conditions and other		
10	matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I approve its form		
11	and content.		
12	DATED:		
13	George G. Braunstein Law Offices of George G. Braunstein Attorney for Respondents		
14	Automoy for Rospondents		
15	<u>ENDORSEMENT</u>		
16	The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully		
17	submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs.		
18	·		
19	Dated: January, 2012 Respectfully submitted,		
20	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California		
21	GLORIA A. BARRIOS Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
22			
23	MICHAEL BROWN		
24	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant		
25			
26			
27	LA2011600508 60685461.doc		
28			
	12		
i	STIPIJLATED SETTLEMENT (Case No. 4193)		

1			
2	DATED:		
3	THE MEDICINE SHOPPE; ALBERT WONG By: ALBERT WONG Respondent		
4	Respondent		
5			
6	DATED:		
7	ALBERT WONG		
8	Respondent Live and a 16-th discuss devide Bornel and a 18-th and		
9	I have read and fully discussed with Respondents the terms and conditions and other		
10	matters contained in the above Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order. I approve its form		
11	and content.		
12	DATED: 2-21-2012 George G. Braunstein		
13	Law Offices of George G. Braunstein Attorney for Respondents		
14			
15	ENDORSEMENT		
16	The foregoing Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order is hereby respectfully		
17	submitted for consideration by the Board of Pharmacy of the Department of Consumer Affairs.		
18	March,		
19	Dated: January, 2012 Respectfully submitted,		
20	KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California		
21	GLORIA A. BARRIOS Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
22	m D		
23	MICHAEL BROWN		
24	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Complainant		
25			
26			
27	LA2011600508 60685461.doc		
28			
	12		

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 4193

- 4	1	•	
1	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
2	Attorney General of California GLORIA A. BARRIOS		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General MICHAEL BROWN	•	
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 231237		
İ	300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702		
5	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2095		
6	Facsimile: (213) 897-2804 E-mail: MichaelB.Brown@doj.ca.gov	•	
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE		
9	BOARD OF PHARMACY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS		
10	STATE OF C	CALIFORNIA	
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 4193	
12	ALBERT WONG		
13	20843 Timberline Lane Diamond Bar, CA 91789	ACCUSATION	
14	Original Pharmacist License No. RPH 48183	ACCUSATION	
.	Respondent.		
15	AND		
16	THE MEDICINE SHOPPE,		
17	ALBERT WONG, PHARMACIST -IN-CHARGE		
18	12447 Central Avenue Chino, CA 91710		
19	Pharmacy Permit No. PHY 48384	et a	
20	Respondent.	·	
21			
22	Complainant alleges:		
23	PARTIES		
24	1. Virginia Herold (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official capacity		
25	as the Executive Officer of the Board of Pharmacy, Department of Consumer Affairs.		
26	2. On or about March 23, 2007, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Permit No. PHY		
27	48384 to The Medicine Shoppe; and Albert Wong (Respondent Pharmacy). The Original Permit		
28	expired on November 24, 2010, and has not been renewed.		
	1 Accusation		
- 1			

- 3. On or about August 11, 1995, the Board of Pharmacy issued Original Pharmacist License Number RPH 48183 to Albert Wong (Respondent Wong). The Original Pharmacist License was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought herein and will expire on February 28, 2013, unless renewed.
- 4. The Board records indicate Respondent Wong was the Pharmacist-in-Charge for Respondent Pharmacy since March 23, 2007.

JURISDICTION

- 5. This Accusation is brought before the Board of Pharmacy (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.
- 6. Section 4005 of the Code provides that the Board may adopt rules and regulations, as may be necessary for the protection of the public. Included therein shall be the right to adopt rules and regulations as follows: for the proper and more effective enforcement and administration of this chapter; pertaining to the practice of pharmacy; and pertaining to establishments wherein any drug or device is compounded, prepared, furnished, or dispensed.
- 7. Section 4011 of the Code provides that the Board shall administer and enforce both the Pharmacy Law (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 4000 et seq.) and the Uniform Controlled Substances Act (Health & Safety Code, § 11000 et seq.).
 - 8. Section 4113(c) of the Code states:

"The pharmacist-in-charge shall be responsible for a pharmacy's compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to the practice of pharmacy."

- 9. Section 4300(a) of the Code provides that every license issued by the Board may be suspended or revoked.
- 10. Section 4402(a) of the Code provides that any pharmacist license that is not renewed within three years following its expiration may not be renewed, restored, or reinstated and shall be canceled by operation of law at the end of the three-year period.
- 11. Section 4402(e) of the Code provides that any other license issued by the Board may be canceled by the Board if not renewed within 60 days after its expiration, and any license

.28

canceled in this fashion may not be reissued but will instead require a new application to seek reissuance.

12. Section 118, subdivision (b), of the Code provides that the suspension/expiration/surrender/cancellation of a license shall not deprive the Board/Registrar/Director of jurisdiction to proceed with a disciplinary action during the period within which the license may be renewed, restored, reissued or reinstated

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY PROVISIONS

13. Section 4301 of the Code states:

"The board shall take action against any holder of a license who is guilty of unprofessional conduct or whose license has been procured by fraud or misrepresentation or issued by mistake.

Unprofessional conduct shall include, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- "(j) The violation of any of the statutes of this state, or any other state, or of the United States regulating controlled substances and dangerous drugs.
- "(o) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, or assisting in or abetting the violation of or conspiring to violate any provision or term of this chapter or of the applicable federal and state laws and regulations governing pharmacy, including regulations established by the board or by any other state or federal regulatory agency."
- 14. Section 4067(a) of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that no person or entity shall dispense or furnish, or cause to be dispensed or furnished, dangerous drugs or dangerous devices, as defined in Section 4022 of the Code, on the Internet for delivery to any person in this state without a prescription issued pursuant to a good faith prior examination of a human or animal for whom the prescription is meant if the person or entity either knew or reasonably should have known that the prescription was not issued pursuant to a good faith prior examination of a human or animal, or if the person or entity did not act in accordance with Section 1761 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations. A "good faith prior examination" includes the requirements for a physician and surgeon in Section 2242 of the Code and the requirements for a veterinarian in Section 2032.1 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations.

25

26

27

28

- 15. California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1761, states:
- "(a) No pharmacist shall compound or dispense any prescription which contains any significant error, omission, irregularity, uncertainty, ambiguity or alteration. Upon receipt of any such prescription, the pharmacist shall contact the prescriber to obtain the information needed to validate the prescription.
- (b) Even after conferring with the prescriber, a pharmacist shall not compound or dispense a controlled substance prescription where the pharmacist knows or has objective reason to know that said prescription was not issued for a legitimate medical purpose."
- Section 4067(b) of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that a violation of Code section 4067 subjects a person or entity to either a fine of up to twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) per occurrence pursuant to a citation issued by the board or a civil penalty of twentyfive thousand dollars (\$25,000) per occurrence.
- Section 125.3 of the Code provides, in pertinent part, that the Board/Registrar/Director may request the administrative law judge to direct a licentiate found to have committed a violation or violations of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES / DANGEROUS DRUGS

- Section 4021 of the Code provides that a "controlled substance" means any substance listed in Schedules I through V contained in Health and Safety Code section 11053 et seq.
- Section 4022 of the Code states:

"Dangerous drug" or "dangerous device" means any drug or device unsafe for self-use in humans or animals, and includes the following:

(a) Any drug that bears the legend: "Caution: federal law prohibits dispensing

- without prescription," "Rx only," or words of similar import.

 (b) Any device that bears the statement: "Caution: federal law restricts this device to sale by or on the order of a ____," "Rx only," or words of similar import, the blank to be filled in with the designation of the practitioner licensed to use or order use of the device.
- (c) Any other drug or device that by federal or state law can be lawfully dispensed only on prescription or furnished pursuant to Section 4006.
- Hydrocodone is the generic name for Vicodin, a combination narcotics used to relieve moderate to severe pain, and is a Schedule III controlled substance as listed in Health and Safety Code section 11056(e)(4).

- 21. Alprazolam, also known under the brand name Xanax, is a Schedule IV controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11057(d)(1), and is a drug of the benzodiazepine class used to treat anxiety and panic attacks.
- 22. **Temazepam** is generic for **Restoril**, is a Schedule IV controlled substance under Health and Safety Code section 11057(d)(29) and a dangerous drug per Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is used in treatment of insomnia.
- 23. Fiorinal with Codeine is a brand name for a compound of aspirin, caffeine, butalbital, a Schedule III controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11056(c)(3) and a dangerous drug as designated by Business and Professions Code section 4022, and codeine, a Schedule III controlled substance as designated by Health and Safety Code section 11056(e)(2) and a dangerous drug as designated by Business and Professions Code section 4022. Butalbital is a non-narcotic analgesic drug often prescribed as a treatment for migraines or tension headaches. Codeine is a narcotic pain reliever and muscle relaxant.
- 24. Cyclobenzaprine, is generic for Flexeril, a dangerous drug as designated by Business and Professions Code section 4022. It is a muscle relaxant drug.

CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE, AS TO BOTH RESPONDENTS FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Improper Dispensing or Furnishing Dangerous Drugs on the Internet)

- 25. Respondent are subject to discipline under Code section 4067(a), in that between on or about January 22, 2008 and March 09, 2009, Respondents dispensed, furnished, or caused to be dispensed or furnished, dangerous drugs, as defined in Code section 4022, on the Internet for delivery to persons in the state of California without a prescription issued pursuant to a good faith prior examination, and the Respondent knew or reasonably should have known that the prescription was not issued pursuant to a good faith prior examination, or the Respondent did not act in accordance with Section 1761 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations:
- a. Dispensing or furnishing one hundred eighty-six (186) prescriptions for dangerous drugs, including Hydrocodone/Acetaminophen (APAP), Alprazolam, Temazepam, Aspirin/Butalbital/Caffeine/Codeine and Cyclobenzaprine.

3 4

5 6

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Dispensing of Erroneous or Uncertain Prescription(s))

26. Respondent are each and severally subject to discipline under section(s) 4301(j), (o), and/or 4113(c) of the Code, and/or California Code of Regulations, title 16, section 1761, in that between on or about January 22, 2008 and March 09, 2009, Respondents dispensed, attempted to dispense, assisted or abetted the dispensing of, and/or conspired to dispense, prescription(s) containing one or more significant errors, omissions, irregularities, uncertainties, ambiguities or alterations, without contacting the prescriber to validate the prescription, and/or having objective reason(s) to know that the prescription(s) was/were not issued for a legitimate medical purpose.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Board of Pharmacy issue a decision:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Pharmacy License No. PHY, 48384 issued to The Medicine Shoppe; and Albert Wong (Respondent Pharmacy);
- Revoking or suspending Original Pharmacist License Number RPH 48183 issued to 2. Albert Wong (Respondent Wong);
- 3. Ordering Respondent Pharmacy and Respondent Wong to jointly and severally pay the Board of Pharmacy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 125.3;
 - 4. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

Executive Officer Board of Pharmacy

Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

LA2011600508 60685876.doc

Exhibit B

Letter by Respondents

ALBERT WONG

Pharmacist 20843 Timberline Lane Diamondbar, California 91789

February 29, 2012

To My fellow Pharmacist Colleagues:

I am writing this letter to share with you my experience of running my own pharmacy. I always wanted to own and operate my own pharmacy, and I responded to a franchise solicitation from "The Medicine Shoppe." They offered to loan me money to secure a lease and to build out of the pharmacy store, and help me get started. I did not consult a lawyer or accountant to analyze the proposals. Shortly after opening up my own franchise pharmacy with "The Medicine Shoppe," I soon realize that this was the biggest mistake I ever made in my pharmacy career. First of all, I had personally guaranteed all the loans for the franchise of "The Medicine Shoppe." I never consulted a financial expert to pencil out realistic revenue projections which would include debt service for this dream I had of owning and running my own pharmacy. The royalty fees or franchise fees were 5% of gross sales. Furthermore, I had accumulated huge amount of loans for the build out of the store. The main creditors were the wholesaler, the landlord, vendors, royalties fees from the franchisor, and the business loans from the Medicine Shoppe. At some point, I realized that if business didn't pick up, I would be in serious jeopardy of defaulting on my loans, which I had never done before. I became a sitting duck for people to approach me for ways in "legally increase my revenue."

I put myself in an awkward financial position that created unrealistic revenue expectations from a business just starting out. These types of financial pressures created a perfect environment for disreputable people to prey on me. One day I was contacted by John Maddaloni, an officer of "Advance Medical Group." He told me that they were looking for a few pharmacies to help them out and that their current pharmacy was extremely busy and could not fulfill all their prescriptions. The first several times he contacted me, I told him I wasn't interested, but I made the mistake of asking him details of his operations. When I learned that most of the prescriptions were for controlled substances, I immediately told him I wasn't interested. He kept contacting me and pressuring me to help him fill these prescriptions. In another, conversation, he even produced copies "California law" trying to convince me to join their perfectly legal operation. They even gave me names and phone numbers to other pharmacist who were doing business with them without incident as a part of their carefully scripted confidence plot.

These internet guys singled me out, knew exactly what position I was in as a new business owner, probably targeted my name, and knew how to prey on my weaknesses. Given the huge debt and the burden of the overhead cost of running the my own pharmacy business, I finally accepted his offer to begin filling prescriptions for them, even though I didn't feel entirely comfortable with this business scheme. I called and confirmed that these were legitimate prescription from a licensed physician. I spoke with the physicians. The physicians told me they were merely authorizing refills for their pain clinic and that they were operating under the

2/29/12

Albert Wong Page 2 of 2

"telemedicine" regulation. As a new business owner, I didn't have the resources to hire an attorney to review the legal matters given to me. These prescriptions would be sent to me via FedEx on a daily basis and upon filling the prescriptions I would FedEx it the patients. Furthermore, I felt more reassured that this process was "legal" since iny wholesaler placed our store under review for increased in purchasing of these controlled substances and even they kept approving my ordering. The incentives to fill prescription were just like any other third party plan. The average compensation was approproximately \$20 per script. I filled on average 14 scripts per month for Advance Medical for about 13 months to California residents.

As it turns out, this business scheme is illegal and we all now know it was not what these imscrupulous predators or slick internet businessmen represented it to be. Specifically, from 1/22/2008 to 3/9/2009, The Medicine Shoppe furnished 186 controlled substance/dangerous drug prescriptions to California residents pursuant to prescriptions issued via the Internet which were obtained without a good faith prior examination. This was in violation of Business and Professional code 4067. After I was cited for this, I felt that I had betrayed my profession and decided voluntarily to close down my pharmacy.

My participation in this internet scheme has tarnished my reputation as a pharmacist. I have lost face among my colleagues. My family has suffered as a result of this incident, both financially and emotionally. Financially, we had to pay huge sums to the landlord from a civil settlement for the early termination of the lease. In addition, I have also incurred huge attorney's fee in the process, and payment of civil penalties to the Board of Pharmacy. Currently, I am still civilly liable to the Medicine Shoppe for the early breach of the franchise contract. Emotionally, my family has been mortified by this whole incident as we never had any kind of trouble with the law. For the public health, I have endangered people's lives by filling prescriptions without a good faith examination and I have tarnished the reputation of our profession as "one of the most trusted professions."

Given the benefit of hindsight, I should not have ventured into my own business nor trusted this business proposition without obtaining independent legal and accounting advice. I certainly recommend everyone to trust their own instincts; if you don't feel comfortable with filling a prescription, do not fill it. As a new pharmacist or even an experienced pharmacist like me, you must be very careful and only take advice from trusted professionals who have your best interest at heart and not strangers who come to you with a quick fix solution that they swear on their life is "Legal" and "everyone else is filling internet prescriptions." This is the "trap" to be avoided at all cost.

Yours Truly,

Wong, Rph 48183

The Medicine Shoppe, Phy 48384